# REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of August 2, 2007 (Office Action). This response is filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, and as such, no fees are believed to be due. The Examiner is expressly authorized, however, to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-18, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,263,311 to Dildy (hereinafter Dildy). Claims 8, 11, 19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dildy in view of U.S. Patent 6,064,303 to Klein, *et al.* (hereinafter Klein). Additionally, Claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to express their sincere appreciation for the Examiner's suggestion regarding possible claim language to address the issues raised under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to emphasize that, in addition to receiving a sound signal, the procedures further include the practical result of sending a notification to a user when an identified security event has occurred. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2 and 13 have been cancelled.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections based on the cited references, Applicants nevertheless have amended certain claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application. Applicants respectfully note, however, that the amendments are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

6

## *Claim Amendments*

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. Applicants also have amended dependent Claims 14-22 to maintain consistency among the claims. As amended, the claims recite additional steps taken when a security event has been determined to have occurred. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of any of the claim amendments.

## *Certain Features Recited In The Claims*

One aspect of the invention, exemplified by Claim 1, is a method of monitoring using a speech recognition engine. The method can include receiving a sound signal within the speech recognition engine, and determining at least one attribute of the sound signal. The method also can include comparing the attribute of the sound signal with at least one acoustic model associated with a security event. If, based upon comparison of the attribute of the sound signal with at least one acoustic model, the sound signal is identified as the security event, then according to this method a user can be notified over a specified communications channel.

Additionally, if, based upon comparison of the attribute of the sound signal with at least one acoustic model, the sound signal is identified as the security event, a recording can be initiated. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0027], 3-4.) In response to an event identified as a security event, a recording of an audio loop can be initiated for a predetermined time frame to record other sounds signals. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0027], 4-8.)

7

## *The Claims Define Over The Cited References*

As already noted, independent Claims 1 and 12 were both rejected as being anticipated by Dildy. Dildy is directed to a system and method for providing security based upon detecting sounds. (See, e.g., Dildy, Col. 2, lines 23-26.) Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Dildy fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, every feature recited in Claims 1 and 12. Applicants also submit that Klein, cited at page 4 of the Office Action, as disclosing the use of a personal computer for security monitoring similarly lacks the features not found in Dildy.

For example, Dildy fails to teach initiating a recording whenever, based, upon a comparison of an attribute of a sound signal with at least one acoustic model associated with a security event, that a security event has occurred. Specifically, Dildy does not initiate an audio loop for a predetermined time frame to record other sounds signals if and when a security event is deemed to have occurred.

Dildy records voices, but only for the purpose of creating a voice list. The voice list comprises "voice patterns" to which other voice sounds are compared to determine whether the voice is that of an "authorized user." (See, e.g., Col. 5, lines 1-6; see also FIG. 2, item 210.) Dildy nowhere even suggests that the recording of voice or any other sounds is initiated in response to determining that a security event has occurred. Thus, with Dildy, the only sounds recorded are those of an authorized person; that is, Dildy provides no mechanism for recording other sounds that can follow the initial occurrence of a break-in or other security event.

Dildy's purpose for recording sound is explicitly described as being only for storing recorded voices of authorized users and recordings of other acceptable sounds:

[T]he voice recognition unit 140 is employed to generate acceptable voice

patterns from normal conversations of authorized users. <u>A recording may</u>

be initiated, by an authorized user, to record sounds of authorized individuals during their conversations. The recorded conversations may be used to create voice patterns for the authorized individuals that are stored in the voice list 130. Alternatively, voice patterns may be generated by recording specific words and phrases pronounced by each of the authorized individuals. The generated voice patterns are stored in the voice list 130. Generally speaking, each voice pattern includes at least one word pronounced by an authorized user. The user is any human or non-human source of sound. Since the voice list 130 is developed from acceptable voice patterns, the availability of a sound, generated by a source in the space to be protected, that matches (based on predetermined criteria) at least one entry in the voice list 130 may be considered acceptable. (Dildy, Col. 4, lines 31-47; see also FIG. 2, item 210.)

As explicitly described in the reference, Dildy only records sounds that are *later* used for the sake of comparison with other sounds to determine whether a suspicious event has occurred. Dildy does not record sounds in *response to*, or *following*, a detected security event Nowhere, does Dildy even suggest recording sounds in response to a suspicious event. It follows that Dildy does not explicitly or inherently teach initiating a recording of an audio loop for a predetermined time frame to record other sounds signals if, based upon comparison of the attribute of a sound signal with at least one acoustic model, the sound signal is identified as a security event, as expressly recited in Claims 1 and 12. It further follows that Dildy fails to provide the advantages offered by Applicants' invention, which include the capability of recording sounds that follow and likely relate to an identified security event.

9

Accordingly, Dildy fails to teach every feature recited in Claims 1 and 12. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 1 and 12 define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that, whereas each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 or Claim 12 while reciting additional features, each of the dependent claims likewise defines over the prior art.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: November 2, 2007

/Richard A. Hinson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

10